



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,968	06/30/2001	Michael J. Cleary	CEL-97	2589

23508 7590 04/08/2004
LUNDEEN & DICKINSON, LLP
PO BOX 131144
HOUSTON, TX 77219-1144

EXAMINER

JUNG, DAVID YTUK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2134	

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/681,968

Applicant(s)

CLEARY ET AL

Examiner

David Y Jung

Art Unit

2134

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 March 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

CLAIMS PRESENTED

Claims 1-38 are presented.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook et al. (cited by Applicant, US Patent 5,860,068, hereinafter also referred as "Cook") and Lewine (cited by Applicant, US Patent 5,784,565).

Claims 1, 6, 10, 14, 18, 26, 34, 38 are the independent claims. The other claims are dependent claims.

Regarding claim 1, Cook teaches "A system comprising: a workstation accessible by a customer; a server coupled to the workstation; a database coupled to the server; and report generating software accessible through the server, wherein the software receives an ,,, from the customer; sends a page to the workstation (column 3, lines 30-

Art Unit: 2134

46, i.e. launching to website – which suggests server, database, etc., also e-mail – which suggests such reports and client, etc.), wherein the page specifies one or more subject areas within the database to which the customer is permitted access; and generates a report based upon an election of one of the subject areas by the customer (column 3, lines 30-46, web browser software – which suggests such page, etc., also e-mail—which suggests such reports, etc.).”

These passages of Cook do not teach “access key.”

Lewine teaches “access key (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. profile, password)” for the motivation of providing convenient access to the user (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. “never has to enter it again”).

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Cook with Lewine for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 6, Cook teaches “A method comprising: receiving an access request from a customer at a workstation; ascertaining ... by the customer based upon the access request; and sending a report responsE to the workstation (column 3, lines 30-46, i.e. launching to website – which suggests server, database, etc., also e-mail – which suggests such reports and client, etc.) .

These passages of Cook do not teach “rights to database.”

Lewine teaches "rights to database (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. profile, password)" for the motivation of providing convenient access to the user (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. "never has to enter it again").

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Cook with Lewine for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 10, Cook teaches "An article comprising a medium storing instructions that enable a system to: receive an access request from a customer at a workstation; ascertain ...by the customer based upon the access request; and send a report response to the workstation (column 3, lines 30-46, i.e. launching to website -- which suggests server, database, etc., also e-mail -- which suggests such reports and client, etc)."

These passages of Cook do not teach "rights to database."

Lewine teaches "rights to database (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. profile, password)" for the motivation of providing convenient access to the user (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. "never has to enter it again").

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Cook with Lewine for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 14, Cook teaches "A system comprising: a workstation accessible by a customer; a server coupled to the workstation; a database coupled to the server; and ordering software accessible through the server, wherein the software: receives an ... from the customer; determines that a portion of the database is accessible to the customer; fulfills a customer request for data from the portion (column 3, lines 30-46, i.e. launching to website -- which suggests server, database, etc., also e-mail -- which suggests such reports and client, etc.)."

These passages of Cook do not teach "access key."

Lewine teaches "access key (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. profile, password)" for the motivation of providing convenient access to the user (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. "never has to enter it again").

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Cook with Lewine for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 18, Cook teaches "A method comprising: receiving an access request from a customer at a workstation; ascertaining ... by the customer based upon the access request; receiving a request from the customer; and sending a response to the customer (column 3, lines 30-46, i.e. launching to website -- which suggests server, database, etc., also e-mail -- which suggests such reports and client, etc.)."

These passages of Cook do not teach "rights to database."

Lewine teaches "rights to database (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. profile, password)" for the motivation of providing convenient access to the user (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. "never has to enter it again").

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Cook with Lewine for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 26, Cook teaches "An article comprising a medium storing instructions that enable a system to: receive an access request from a customer at a workstation; ascertain ... by the customer based upon the access request; receive a request from the customer; and send a response to the customer (column 3, lines 30-46, i.e. launching to website – which suggests server, database, etc., also e-mail – which suggests such reports and client, etc)."

These passages of Cook do not teach "rights to database."

Lewine teaches "rights to database (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. profile, password)" for the motivation of providing convenient access to the user (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. "never has to enter it again").

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Cook with Lewine for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 34, Cook teaches "A system comprising: a workstation accessible by a customer; a server coupled to the workstation; a database coupled to the server; report generating software accessible through the server, wherein the software: receives an access key from the customer; sends a page to the workstation, wherein the page specifies one or more subject areas within the database to which the customer is permitted access; and generates a report based upon an election of one of the subject areas by the customer; and ordering software accessible through the server, wherein the software: receives an ... from the customer; determines that a portion of the database is accessible to the customer; fulfills a customer request for data from the portion (column 3, lines 30-46, i.e. launching to website -- which suggests server, database, etc., also e-mail -- which suggests such reports and client, etc.)."

These passages of Cook do not teach "access key."

Lewine teaches "access key (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. profile, password)" for the motivation of providing convenient access to the user (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. "never has to enter it again").

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Cook with Lewine for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claim 38, Cook teaches "A system comprising: a workstation accessible by a customer; a server coupled to the workstation; a database coupled to the server; report generating software accessible through the server, wherein the

Art Unit: 2134

software: receives an ... from the customer; sends a page to the workstation, wherein the page specifies one or more subject areas within the database to which the customer is permitted access; and generates a report based upon an election of one of the subject areas by the customer; and ordering software accessible through the server, wherein the software: receives an access key from the customer; determines that a portion of the database is accessible to the customer; fulfills a customer request for data from a portion (column 3, lines 30-46, i.e. launching to website -- which suggests server, database, etc., also e-mail -- which suggests such reports and client, etc.)."

These passages of Cook do not teach "access key."

Lewine teaches "access key (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. profile, password)" for the motivation of providing convenient access to the user (column 2, lines 50-65, i.e. "never has to enter it again").

Hence, it would have been obvious to those of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the claimed invention to combine Cook with Lewine for the motivation noted in the previous paragraphs so as to teach the claimed invention.

Regarding claims 2 (browser, etc.), 3 (html, etc.), 4 (customized page, etc.), 5 (frame, etc.) these features are well known in the art for the motivation of providing convenient web pages to the user. For example, Cook suggests these features. (column 3, lines 30-46, web browser software -- which suggests such page, etc., also e-mail—which suggests such reports, etc.)

Regarding claims 7 (browser etc.), 8 (frame, etc.), 9 (html, etc.), these features are well known in the art for the motivation of providing convenient web pages to the user. For example, Cook suggests these features. (column 3, lines 30-46, web browser software – which suggests such page, etc., also e-mail—which suggests such reports, etc.)

Regarding claims 11 (browser, etc.), 12 (frame, etc.), 13 (html, etc.), these features are well known in the art for the motivation of providing convenient web pages to the user. For example, Cook suggests these features. (column 3, lines 30-46, web browser software – which suggests such page, etc., also e-mail—which suggests such reports, etc.).

Regarding claims 15 (packets, etc.), 16 (xml, etc.), 17 (email, etc.), these features are well known in the art for the motivation of providing convenient web pages to the user. For example, Cook suggests these features. (column 3, lines 30-46, web browser software – which suggests such page, etc., also e-mail—which suggests such reports, etc.).

Regarding claims 19 (xml, etc.), 20 (database etc.), 21 (xml, etc.), 22 (customer request, etc.), 23 (xml, etc.) 24 (customer request, etc.) 25 (workstation, etc.), these features are well known in the art for the motivation of providing convenient web pages to the user. For example, Cook suggests these features. (column 3, lines 30-46, web browser software – which suggests such page, etc., also e-mail—which suggests such reports, etc.).

Regarding claims 27, 29, 31, 33 (various xml handlings) and 28, 30, 32 (various customer request handlings), these features are well known in the art for the motivation of providing convenient web pages to the user. For example, Cook suggests these features. (column 3, lines 30-46, web browser software – which suggests such page, etc., also e-mail—which suggests such reports, etc.).

Regarding claims 35, 36, 37 (various order handlings),), these features are well known in the art for the motivation of providing convenient web pages to the user. For example, Cook suggests these features. (column 3, lines 30-46, web browser software – which suggests such page, etc., also e-mail—which suggests such reports, etc.).

Conclusion

The art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The art disclosed general background.

Points of Contact

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Application/Control Number: 09/681,968
Art Unit: 2134

Page 11

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7239, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 746-5606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to David Jung whose telephone number is (703) 308-5262
or Greg Morse whose telephone number is (703) 308-4789.

Application/Control Number: 09/681,968

Page 12

Art Unit: 2134

David Jung

Patent Examiner

2004-04-03

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a large, loopy initial 'D' followed by a long, sweeping horizontal stroke that ends in a small upward flick.